



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,869	05/04/2001	David J. Anderson	CALTE.004C1	1088

20995 7590 07/30/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP  
2040 MAIN STREET  
FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
----------

ULM, JOHN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1646

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/849,869

Applicant(s)

Anderson et al.

Examiner

John Ulm

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 9, 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2, 13, 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1646

1) Claims 1 to 86 are pending in the instant application.

2) Claims 1 to 15 and 17 to 86, As well as claim 16 in so far as it relates to any of the sequences recited therein other than SEQ ID NO:16 (MrgXI), are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 23, filed 09 June of 2003.

3) The instant specification is objected to because there is text missing from the continuing data in line 7 of page 1. Correction is required.

4) The instant specification does not comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(U)(1), which states that partial views of a drawing which are intended to form one complete view, whether contained on one or several sheets, must be identified by the same number followed by a capital letter. Figure 1 of the instant application, for example, is presented on three separate panels. The three sheets of drawings which are labeled " Figure 1A" in the instant specification should be renumbered "Figures 1A, 1B and 1C". Applicant is reminded that once the drawings are changed to meet the separate numbering requirement of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(U)(1), Applicant is required to file an amendment to change the Brief Description of the Drawings and the rest of the specification accordingly.

5) Claim 16 is objected to as reciting an improper Markush Group. M.P.E.P. 803.02 states that:

Art Unit: 1646

“Since the decisions in *In re Weber* \*\*, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978); and *In re Haas*, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention, *In re Harnish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); *Ex Parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.”

M.P.E.P. 2173.05(h) states that “when the Markush group occurs in a claim reciting a process or a combination (**not a single compound**), it is sufficient if the members of the group are disclosed in the specification to possess at least **one property in common which is mainly responsible for their function in the claimed relationship**, and it is clear from their very nature or from the prior art that all of them possess this property”. It further states that “[w]here a Markush expression is applied only to a portion of a chemical compound, **the propriety of the grouping is determined by a consideration of the compound as a whole**, and does not depend on there being a community of properties in the members of the Markush expression” (emphasis added). The instant claims recite an improper Markush group because they refer to fifty two different individual amino acid sequences which do not reflect a single inventive concept because they lack a common utility which is based upon shared structural feature or combination of features lacking from the prior art. Correction is required.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 1646

6) Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because it is drawn to an invention with no apparent or disclosed specific and substantial credible utility. The instant application has provided a description of an isolated DNA encoding a protein identified therein as Mrg XI, and the protein encoded thereby. Whereas the instant discloses that Mrg XI is a human G protein-coupled receptor that is expressed in the dorsal root ganglia (DRG), it does not disclose a **specific** biological role for this protein or its significance to a particular disease, disorder of physiological process which one would wish to manipulate for a desired clinical effect. The instant specification describes a plurality of proteins, many of which are members of the G protein-coupled receptor family, that appear to be expressed almost exclusively in dorsal root ganglia. The instant specification further discloses that dorsal root ganglia is involved in nociception. However, the instant specification does not ascribe a specific role for Mrg XI in nociception and one of ordinary skill would not reasonably believe that all of the plurality of different putative DRG-associated receptor proteins described in the instant specification play a common role in nociception.

It is clear from the instant specification that the receptor protein described therein is what is termed an "orphan receptor" in the art. This is a protein whose cDNA has been isolated because of its similarity to known proteins. There is little doubt that, after complete characterization, this protein may be found to have a specific and substantial credible utility. This further characterization, however, is part of the act of invention and until it has been undertaken Applicant's claimed invention is incomplete. Whereas one could readily employ a putative receptor protein of the instant invention in an assay to identify ligands thereto the information

Art Unit: 1646

obtained thereby would be of little use until one discovers the identity of those physiological processes moderated by that putative receptor. Because the instant specification has failed to credibly identify a physiological process **which has been shown** to be influenced by the activation or inhibition of a putative receptor protein of the instant invention an artisan would have no way of predicting what effects the administration of that ligand to an organism would have. The assertion that Mrg XI is involved in pain sensation or transmission is of little value unless one knows specifically what effects the activation or inhibition of that protein is going to have on a subject. If one can not predict the effects that the administration of a ligand of the putative receptor of the instant invention is going to have on an organism then it is unclear as to what practical benefit is derived by the public from the identification of that ligand.

The instant situation is directly analogous to that which was addressed in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (Sus. Ct, 1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anti-cancer activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an anti-tumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are "useful" to the chemical arts when this term is given its broadest interpretation. However, the court held that this broad interpretation was not the intended definition of "useful" as it appears in 35 U.S.C. § 101, which requires that an invention must have either an immediately obvious or fully disclosed "real world" utility. The court held that:

Art Unit: 1646

“The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility”, “ [u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field”, and “a patent is not a hunting license”, “ [i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion.”

The instant claims are drawn to a protein of as yet undetermined function or biological significance. There is no evidence of record or credible line of reasoning that would support a conclusion the a protein of the instant invention is associated in any way with the plurality of disorders that are listed on page 29 of the instant specification. Until some actual and specific significance can be attributed to the protein identified in the specification as Mrg VI, or the gene encoding it, the instant invention is incomplete. The protein encoded by a DNA of the instant invention is a compound known to be structurally analogous to proteins which are known in the art as G protein-coupled receptors. In the absence of a knowledge of the natural ligands or biological significance of this protein, there is no immediately obvious patentable use for it. To employ a protein of the instant invention in the identification of substances which inhibit or induce its activity is clearly to use it as the object of further research which has been determined by the courts to be a utility which, alone, does not support patentability. Since the instant specification does not disclose a credible and practical "real world" use for Mrg VI in its currently available form then the claimed invention is incomplete and, therefore, does not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being useful.

Art Unit: 1646

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7) Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to use the instant invention for those reasons given above with regard to the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8) Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 16 is vague and indefinite in so far as it employs the term "Mrg polypeptide" as a limitation. Because the instant specification does not identify that property or combination of properties which is unique to and, therefore, definitive of a "Mrg polypeptide" an artisan can not determine if a compound which meets all of the other limitations of a claim would then be included or excluded from the claimed subject matter by the presence of this limitation. This claim is also confusing because of the second occurrence of the word "comprising", which should be replaced by the term "that is".

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --



Art Unit: 1646

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

35 U.S.C. § 120 states that:

An application for patent for an invention disclosed in the manner provided by the first paragraph of section 112 of this title in an application previously filed in the United States, or as provided by section 363 of this title, which is filed by an inventor or inventors named in the previously filed application shall have the same effect, as to such invention, as though filed on the date of the prior application, if filed before the patenting or abandonment of or termination of proceedings on the first application or on an application similarly entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the first application and if it contains or is amended to contain a specific reference to the earlier filed application.

9) Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by the Ahmad et al. patent publication (WO 99/32519, cited by Applicant), which provided a written description of the claimed protein in SEQ ID NO:9 therein. Applicant is advised that the instant application can only receive benefit under 35 U.S.C. § 120 from an earlier application which meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, with respect to the now claimed invention. Because the instant application does not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for those reasons given above and it is a divisional of application Serial Number 09/704,707, the prior application also does not meet those requirements and, therefore, is unavailable under 35 U.S.C. § 120.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John D. Ulm whose telephone number is (703) 308-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached at (703) 308-6564.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4242 or (703) 872-9306. Official responses under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 should be directed to (703) 872-9307.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



JOHN ULM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800